

arranged such that any given receiver receives a signal much more strongly from one repeater than from any other repeater. The Pratt invention works completely differently, where multiple repeaters delays are coordinated to cause simultaneous data arrival at a given receiver.

To make the distinction between the novel method of the Pratt invention and the prior Gainey invention, claim 1 of the application has been amended. We submit that the attached amendment to claim 1 makes claim 1 patentable over Gainey. Since claims 2-4 and claim 7 are dependent on claim 1, we submit that claims 2-4 and 7 are now also patentable over Gainey.

The examiner further states that:

“Regarding claim 15, Gainey et al. disclose a transceiver for use in a system for dynamically routing wireless signals, said transceiver comprising:
means for receiving a wireless signal (see fig.1, element 100-1, and par.031);
means for modulating said wireless signal, said modulating means coupled to said receiving means (see par.051);
means for digitizing said wireless signal, said digitizing means coupled to said modulating means (see fig.3, element 380);
means for delaying transmission of said wireless signal, said delaying means coupled to said digitizing means (see par.020);
means for amplifying said wireless signal, said amplifying means coupled to said delaying means (see figt.3, element PA325); and
means for transmitting said wireless signal, said transmitting means coupled to said amplifying means (see par.031-032).”

The delays of the plurality of repeaters in the Pratt invention are dynamically adjustable, such that the signals received from a plurality of repeaters can be configured to cause the signals from that plurality of repeaters to arrive aligned in time at a given receiver. This is not true for the Gainey invention. Accordingly, claim 15 has been amended to clearly differentiate the novel aspects of the Pratt invention over Gainey. We submit that the attached amendment to claim 15 makes claim 15 patentable over Gainey.

The examiner further states that:

“Regarding claim 16, Gainey et al. disclose a method of routing a wireless signal between two points, said method comprising the steps of:
transmitting a wireless signal as a plurality of wireless signals (see fig. 1, element 110);
receiving said plurality of wireless signals at a repeating transceiver as a received plurality of wireless signals (see fig.1, element 100-1, see par.031, it is considered that at least another the repeater is placed in the building to relay signals to the final destination);
in said repeating transceiver, delaying each of said plurality of wireless signals by a separately predetermined delay to produce a set of delayed wireless signals (see par.020); combining said delayed wireless signals into a reconstituted wireless

signal (see par.051); and re-transmitting said reconstituted wireless signal (see par.032)."

The Gainey invention does not in fact provide for delaying each of the plurality of wireless signals by a separately predetermined delay, and this is critical in order to be able to time-correlate the multiple received signals. Thus the Gainey invention does not anticipate claim 16, and we submit that claim 16 is patentable over Gainey as originally presented. Claims 17-19, 21, and 22 are dependent on claim 16, so we submit that these claims are also patentable over Gainey as originally presented.

Claim rejections under USC Section 103:

The examiner rejects claim 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gainey et al. (US Pub. 20040157551) in view of Seo et al. (US Pub. 2004/0203542). Since the examiner has not rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the claims on which claims 5 and 20 depend, it is assumed that the arguments above as to why claim 1 is not patentable (as amended), and why claim 16 is patentable (as previously presented) obviate the examiners rejection of claims 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

We therefore submit that claims 1-4, 7, 15-19 and 21-22 are now patentable.

We have attached an amended set of claims, a copy of the above-referenced office action and a check in the amount of \$510 for an extension of time within the third month, with small entity status claimed.

Sincerely



Lee Weinstein, Registration #56,261

Certificate of express mailing: I certify that this document including the attached amended claims, check for \$510, and copy of the related office action were deposited with the US Postal Service as Express Mail, post office to addressee, June 12, 2007, express mail label number EQ247583287US.


Lee Weinstein